Chair John DeLeo, Vice-Chair Rick Lyles, Secretary Nelson Geel, Member Molly Friedland, Member Marc Rich, and Alternate Member Mike Hangge attended the regular meeting of the Ellsworth Planning Board. Alternate Member Patrick Lyons was absent.

Six board members present

City Planner Matthew Williams, Code Enforcement Officer ("CEO") Lori Roberts, Assistant City Planner Elizabeth Littlefield, Deputy Code Enforcement Officer Bobbi Roberts, and Fire and Life Safety Inspector Thomas Canavan were present.

Five staff members present

1.) Call to Order

Chair DeLeo called the meeting to order at 5:29 PM.

Call to Order

2.) Adoption of Minutes from the April 5, 2023 regular meeting.

Adoption of minutes

Vice-Chair Lyles moved to adopt the minutes from the April 5, 2023 regular meeting. Chair DeLeo seconded the motion. The vote to adopt the minutes from the April 5, 2023 regular meeting was UNANIMOUS (5-0).

UNANIMOUS

3.) Revision to an approved Subdivision entitled Jesse's Beach Subdivision II for Applicant RPM Properties LLC and Owner RPM Maine Enterprises LLC. The proposal is to show the current 100-foot setback along the graham Lake and remove the "stormwater buffer" label along the lake to prevent confusion. The subject property is an approximately 27-acre lot located at Garland Road (Tax Map 107, Lot 17) in the Rural (R) and Limited Residential (LR) Zoning Districts.

Jesse's Beach
Subdivision II

Steve Salisbury was present representing the Applicant. Mr. Salisbury explained that the only change to the Plan is the language on the Plan, there would be no change in the actual lots. Salisbury also said that Lot 10 was sold as per the conditions of approval, so that language will be removed from the Plan. City Planner Williams said that Mr. Salisbury added the historical reference information onto the Plan like he asked, so he had no issues or concerns with the project. Chair DeLeo asked if the working from the Homeowner's Association was going to be put onto the Plan. Mr. Salisbury said that it was not as it was not required.

INTRODUCTION

DISCUSSION

Chair DeLeo opened the public hearing at 5:33PM. There were no members of the public in attendance. DeLeo closed the public hearing at 5:33PM.

Public Hearing Opened and Closed

There were no further questions from the Board. Vice-Chair Lyles moved to approve the revision. Secretary Geel seconded the motion. The vote to approve a revision to an approved subdivision entitled <u>Jesse's Beach Subdivision II</u> for Applicant RPM Properties LLC and Owner RPM Maine Enterprises LLC was UNANIMOUS.

APPROVED

4.) Revision to an approved Subdivision entitled <u>The Village</u> for Applicant Joseph Treadwell and Owner Village Way LLC. The proposal is an amendment to a previously approved plan for a land subdivision. The amendment is to adjust the ratio of undeveloped common area to number of dwelling units within the cluster subdivision to allow for the

The Village Subdivision

construction of five duplexes, instead of five single family homes. The common area is being increased to meet the required 80,000 square feet per dwelling unit density requirement in the Drinking Water (DW) Zone. The subject property is an approximately 140-acre lot located at Village Way (Tax Map 46, Lot 19) in the Drinking Water (DW) Zoning District.

Steve Salisbury was in attendance representing the applicant. Chair DeLeo asked City Planner Williams to go over the history of this development as it had been a few years since the development was originally approved. Williams said that this development came before Planning Board in 2017 for sketch, preliminary, final, and a conditional review. Williams explained that on the original application, the developer stated that it was the intention to put 12 tiny homes then it was revised to 12 single-family homes with garages. Williams said that this project came before Planning Board as a cluster land subdivision and ownership of the property has changed since the final approval. The project was initially a phased project and only the first phase has come before Planning Board.

Chair DeLeo asked about the language in the Subdivision Ordinance which states that any revision which adds dwelling units would need to come for a preliminary review and then a final review. Mr. Salisbury said that the lot number is not changing, the only change is that some lots will have duplexes on them instead of a single family home. Vice-Chair Lyles pointed out that it would change the number of dwelling units in the subdivision. DeLeo said that the original application said that it would create 12 dwelling units. Lyles asked what the Board would gain by making the developer come back for a second meeting. DeLeo said that he thought all of the information they would need for a final approval and asked City Planner Williams if Staff needed any more information regarding this project. Williams said that Staff only had one issue with the project and that was the calculations for density in regards to the cluster subdivision. Williams went over the requirements regarding density in a cluster subdivision. Williams explained that there are two different ways of technically measuring an acre, one is by the traditional definition, and the other is based on an antiquated term of measurement known as the 'zoning acre.' If the traditional definition of an acre is used, the development would need to add 1.738 acres of land to the common area in order to meet the requirements. Mr. Salisbury has proposed using the 'zoning acre' definition since it would mean the development would not need to add any more common area. Williams said that he spoke with past planners and long-time staff members who had said that the City had never used the 'zoning acre' definition before, so it was his opinion that the Board use the traditional definition.

Secretary Geel asked if there was any concerns given the density of the actual houses in the subdivision, since they are all very close together. City Planner Williams said that there were not any concerns about this, and in fact, cluster subdivisions are preferred in the Drinking Water Zone given the restrictions. Geel mentioned that the plan looked odd and was unsure that having a field at the end of the row of homes was a true "communal open space" as it was intended. Williams said that there are more phases of the development which will add more housing that would also have access to the common area. Chair DeLeo pointed out that most of the common area was existing on the original plan and the only issue that they are discussing at this meeting is whether or not more land will be added into

INTRODUCTION

DISCUSSION

it. Vice-Chair Lyles went over the reasoning behind the cluster subdivision and how the common area is typically used. Lyles then went on to say that this development does seem odd since the common area is on one edge of the development, several feet from the homes on the other edge of the development.

Vice-Chair Lyles asked if the original plan had any indication that there could be duplexes or if it just mentioned single family homes. City Planner Williams said that in looking at the minutes from back then, the only issue that was discussed were the lines of sight coming out of the development. Lyles posed a hypothetical to Williams, asking if a project came to Planning Board with a single family home and then decides after that they want to put a duplex instead would have to come back to Planning Board to get re-approved. Williams said that usually that would not be the case. He also said that this development is different since the lots will remain under common ownership and will be rented out. Mr. Salisbury said that there is a potential possibility of selling the lots sometime in the future, however that is not the current plan. Member Friedland asked if the common area could ever be sold. Williams explained that the owners of the 12 lots in the subdivision will each have a 1/12 interest in the common area, so it could not be sold on its own.

Chair DeLeo asked about the septic plans for the development. He said that originally, each lot had its own septic system and now there are leach fields for 4 of the lots. Mr. Salisbury said that there is also a leach field in the common area. Vice-Chair Lyles asked what would happen if one of the lots were to be sold. Mr. Salisbury said that there would be language added into the deed which called for the maintenance of the shared septic system. Lyles asked if this was a common arrangement. Mr. Salisbury said that it is not uncommon for this type of arrangement to occur.

Chair DeLeo asked if there could be any roads built through the common area. City Planner Williams said that was not allowed. Mr. Salisbury said that the land would not be suitable for a road anyway, so they would not want to build one. Vice-Chair Lyles said that he did not think that this project would have to come back for a second review and that he was comfortable calling it a complete revision. Member Friedland asked if the owners of the property were able to add more land into the common area since they also own the abutting land. Mr. Salisbury said that it would remove some lots from a future phase in the development. Mr. Salisbury also argued that since the 'zoning acre' is defined that is what the ordinance should follow. Williams gave some background on the term 'zoning acre' and how it came to be, mentioning that it is a very outdated term. Williams said that he had had a conversation with the City's lawyer about the difference between a traditional acre and a 'zoning acre.' Williams said that the lawyer believed the table of uses was the controlling factor in this situation and the table of uses only makes reference to a traditional acre. Nowhere on the table of uses or anywhere else in the ordinance is there a mention to a 'zoning acre.' Chair DeLeo said that he believed the 'zoning acre' definition was a bit of a stretch and that he agreed there was no reference to a 'zoning acre' in the table of uses. Lyles asked if it would be a big deal to add more land to the common area since the two abutting parcels were under the same ownership. Mr. Salisbury said that it would not be a huge deal. Lyles then asked if that would impact the review of the revision. Williams said that it would not, and it can just be a condition of approval. Williams also said that the

lawyer was unsure about whether or not the applicant would have to come for a preliminary and final review. He then stated that this ambiguity was in favor of the applicant and the applicant provided enough information for the Board to call it complete.

Chair DeLeo pointed out that the developer's letter to the Water Department listed lot 6 twice. City Planner Williams said that this discrepancy was in the developer's favor since it led to an overestimation of water usage. DeLeo asked if there were going to be any dumpster on the property. Mr. Salisbury said that it was the plan of the owner to have the City pick up the trash and the residents would put it at the end of the road. DeLeo stated his concerns about leaving trash bags on the ground, saying that wildlife could get into it. Vice-Chair Lyles asked what normal subdivisions typically do. Williams said that usually the private owners pay for a private dumpster on the property. DeLeo pointed out that there was some spaces where a dumpster could be put in. Mr. Salisbury said that it was a possibility, however a dumpster is not a requirement.

Chair DeLeo asked if it was the plan for the road to become a public road. Mr. Salisbury said that was the intention. DeLeo asked if they were going to pave the road and when. Salisbury said that they were going to pave once the development is built out farther. DeLeo asked if there was anything in the ordinance that dictated when it would need to be paved. Mr. Salisbury said that the ordinance says the road would need to be built out 2/3 of the way before the City will accept it as a public road. DeLeo asked if they would need any sort of waiver for paving. City Planner Williams said that it was the developer's intention to pave the road. Code Enforcement Officer Roberts said that she would need an engineering report once the road is built out to make sure it is suitable for paving. Roberts also said that she made sure that the road was existing and usable up to the existing dwelling units when those were originally put in. Roberts said that the road was built to private road standards.

Fire and Life Safety Inspector Canavan said that the fire hydrants were not shown on the plan. City Planner Williams said that they were and the copy of the plan that Canavan was looking at was a past version, not the most current one that was sent to him. Williams pointed out where the hydrants were on the correct plan. Chair DeLeo asked if the change to duplexes would impact his approval from his department. Canavan said that it would not.

Chair DeLeo opened the public hearing at 6:00PM. There were no members of the public in attendance. DeLeo closed the public hearing at 6:00PM.

Secretary Geel asked Chair DeLeo how to phrase the motion. DeLeo said that he agreed that the addition of the 1.738 acres would be a condition of approval.

Secretary Geel moved to find the plan complete with the condition that the developer add 1.738 acres of common area. Vice-Chair Lyles seconded the motion. The vote to approve the revision of an approved subdivision entitled <u>The Village</u> for Applicant Joseph Treadwell and Owner Village Way LLC subject to the condition that the Applicant

Public Hearing Opened and Closed

APPROVED W/CONDITION

will add 1.738 acres of land into the common area to fulfill the Drinking Water Zoning District requirements was UNANIMOUS (5-0).

5.) Final Plan Review of a Minor Subdivision entitled Washington Luxe/3 Ruger Way for Applicant/Owner Ruger Properties, LLC. The proposal is to split an existing multi-family residential subdivision existing on one lot into two lots. No other development or changes to the property will occur. The subject property is an approximately 1.19-acre lot located at 3 Ruger Way (Tax Map 13, Lot 26) in the Downtown (DT) Zoning District.

Washington
Luxe/3 Ruger Way

Steve Salisbury was present representing the Applicant. Mr. Salisbury said that nothing will actually be changing to the property, only that there will be a dividing line between the two parcels so the second parcel can be sold. Chair DeLeo asked if Staff had any issues with the project. City Planner Williams said that they did not, all of the deed restrictions and conditions regarding the shared utilities were provided.

INTRODUCTION

DISCUSSION

Chair DeLeo opened the public hearing at 6:04PM. There were no members of the public in attendance. DeLeo closed the public hearing at 6:04PM.

Public Hearing
Opened and Closed

Vice-Chair Lyles moved to approve the final plan. Secretary Geel seconded the motion. The vote to approve the Final Plan of a Minor Subdivision entitled <u>Washington Luxe/3 Ruger Way</u> for Applicant/Owner Ruger Properties, LLC was UNANIMOUS.

APPROVED

6.) Preliminary Plan Review of a Major Use Site Plan entitled <u>Proposed Commercial Development</u> for Applicant Alrig USA Acquisitions LLC and Owner Ellsworth No. 1 LLC. The proposal is to create a commercial building with three storefronts, including a drive-thru and two retail pads. The subject property is an approximately 2-acre lot located at 6 Downeast Highway (Tax Map 128, Lot 8) in the Commercial (C) Zoning District.

Proposed Commercial Development

Matthew Bombaci and Samantha Burgner were present representing the Applicant. Mr. Bombaci began by saying that the developers have completed the design phase and are working on the traffic study currently. He said that it was still the intention of the Applicant to have a retail space, a restaurant space, and a coffee shop with a drive-thru. Mr. Bombaci said that the developers had planned for a 13-car queue length and a bypass lane behind the building. In addition, Mr. Bombaci said that any additional queue would spill out into the parking lot of the development, not the street. Mr. Bombaci explained that they were going to be putting in a sidewalk from Downeast Highway to the development, as well as a sidewalk from the development to the Hampton Inn parking lot. There will be a fully enclosed area where the dumpster will be placed. There will also be outdoor seating for the coffee shop, and those figures went into the calculation of the number of parking spaces needed. There will also be a 45-foot greenspace between the development and Downeast Highway. A full landscaping plan has been submitted to the Board. Mr. Bombaci said that their lighting plan was dark sky compliant and all of the lights were angled down as to prevent light intrusion onto neighboring properties. Mr. Bombaci said that he was aware of the note from Staff about the lighting plan and would be asking for more feedback during this meeting. He went on to explain that they have applied with Department of

INTRODUCTION

Environmental Protection (DEP) for a Stormwater Permit and their retention pond would have a filter and a drain so there would be no standing water in that area. As for the traffic study, Mr. Bombaci said that they did provide some preliminary trip generation numbers and are beginning the process of applying to the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) for a Traffic Movement Permit. During that process, the City will be invited to a scoping meeting with members of MDOT. Mr. Bombaci said that the road leading to the Hampton Inn and the parking lot would be used as one of the ingress points for the development. He also said that he was aware that there are 4 high-crash locations in the area, and that those would be discussed during the scoping meeting with MDOT. As to the issue brought up during the Sketch plan review of this development of illegal left turns into the development, Mr. Bombaci said that they were looking at adding wayfinding signage and even a barrier to prevent that. He also said that they will be adding a bike rack in addition to adding the sidewalks, in hopes of promoting more non-automobile traffic into the development. Staff had requested clarification as to the uses of all of the units, as there were some discrepancies on the plans. Mr. Bombaci said that they are still considering the center unit as a restaurant, as the permit requirements are stricter for that use than a general retail space.

Secretary Geel asked Fire and Life Safety Inspector Canavan if the changes to the access points would impact the developer's traffic study. Canavan said that there will be several different ways that a fire truck can access the property, and that will be up to the discretion of the individual driving. Canavan also expressed concerns with driving through the Hampton Inn parking lot as there will be guests walking through the parking lot often. Vice-Chair Lyles asked what other alternatives the fire trucks would have if they did not use the Hampton Inn. Canavan gave a few different possibilities and said that he was open to different options if they were thought of. The Board debated a few different options and the pros and cons of each of those options. Lyles said that if the Fire Department has some options that they are okay with, then the Board should be okay with those options as well. Lyles also said that he believed putting in a mountable curb on Downeast Highway would help the traffic situation. Chair DeLeo said that he thought they should extend the island to discourage illegal U-turns. Lyles stated some concerns with extending the island. The Board discussed the possible benefits and drawbacks of extending the island. Secretary Geel went back to his original question and asked if any changes to the entrances would impact the traffic study. Mr. Bombaci said that they were not concerned with have to redo their traffic study. Member Rich asked if extending the island would be under the purview of the City or MDOT. City Planner Williams said that it would be under MDOT's jurisdiction but it would be a joint effort with the City. Chair DeLeo asked if Ellsworth being a part of the Urban Compact gives the City any more control. The Board discussed whether or not there were any benefits to being in the Urban Compact.

Chair DeLeo stated that he had asked Staff to look at the plans from the two Dunkin Donuts that were in the City. City Planner Williams said that Staff look at the queue lengths from both plans, however those numbers are not as helpful since MDOT has changed their requirements since both of these were put in. Williams said that now, MDOT usually likes to see somewhere around 14 spaces in the queue length. Vice-Chair Lyles pointed out that this development would also be different from those other coffee shops since the spill-

DISCUSSION

out area for the queue goes into the parking lot of the development as opposed to the street. Mr. Bombaci said that they planned their queue length based on the updated MDOT requirements. Alternate Member Hangge expressed concern about the cars blocking individuals who have parked in the blocked parking spaces. Lyles said that would be an issue for the developer because it will still be on their private property. Lyles asked how much space is in the parking lot for people to potentially to still be able to get out. Mr. Bombaci said that the space in between will be 24 feet.

Vice-Chair Lyles then said that there would be a lot of landmarking needed to show that the access way off of Downeast Highway is a two way street. He also said that the island would need to be reshaped to provide more turning guidance onto Downeast Highway. Lyles did express concern with using the Hampton Inn parking lot as a thru-way as there would be so many pedestrians. Lyles did say that as long as Hampton Inn was okay with it, he would not oppose them, although he does think it is an odd arrangement. Ms. Burgner said that they have easements with the Hampton Inn that were put in place when the Inn was developed. She said that when the landowners gave the Inn an easement to make their access road, the Inn also gave the landowners an easement to use their lot as a thru-way. Lyles then asked if any delivery trucks will be using those access ways. Mr. Bombaci went over the typical types of delivery trucks that those coffee shops use are not as heavy as larger delivery trucks. Chair DeLeo pointed out that the issue is always the case when there is a shopping center. Lyles said that he understood that, he just wanted to make sure that the road was built in such a way that would be able to support the large trucks.

Vice-Chair Lyles then expressed concern that the traffic study has not yet been completed at this stage in the process. City Planner Williams said that the developers have fulfilled all of the preliminary requirements regarding traffic, so they are able to be found complete under the preliminary review requirements. Mr. Bombaci said that it was their intention to have the scoping meeting and the public hearing with MDOT and the City before coming back for final plan review. Lyles then brought up the current issues with the traffic signal at the Walgreens. He asked if the developer would work with the City to improve that traffic signal before this development opened, which would add many more left turns. Chair DeLeo then asked if Information Technology Director Jason Ingalls would come in and talk about the improvements already done to that traffic signal. Ingalls came into the room and said that there were improvements made about a month ago so the issues should not be as prevalent. Ingalls also said that he will be working with the developers to alter the timing of the signals once the construction is completed. Lyles then moved onto wayfinding signage and stated that there would be wayfinding signs needed to show access to the site. Mr. Bombaci said that they were willing to put signage up showing where the turns are into the site. Member Friedland suggested putting yellow reflectors into the island to avoid illegal left turns. Lyles thought that this idea was a good idea and suggested that the developer consider those.

Secretary Geel asked about the Code Enforcement Officer Roberts' note about the lighting plan. Roberts noted that there are some areas on the site that go above the regulations. There is some spillover of light onto the Hampton Inn parking lot. Mr. Bombaci noted that there was no spillover onto the street and the reason for the spillover into the

Hampton Inn was because the drive-thru lane was so close to the property line that it made it difficult to prevent spillover. Geel then asked if the Planning Board would even have the authority to grant a waiver for light spilling over onto private property, or if it would be for the property owner to give permission. City Planner Williams said that Staff would look at the lighting plan for the Hampton Inn to see if their light in that area would be brighter than the proposed lighting plan, making this point moot since the light would be washed out. Geel also suggested reaching out to the Hampton Inn to get a letter giving the developer permission for the spillover.

Chair DeLeo opened the public hearing at 6:44PM. There were no members of the public in attendance. DeLeo closed the public hearing at 6:44PM.

Chair DeLeo asked if there were any Staff comments on this project. City Planner Williams said that there was some concern regarding the Hampton Inn parking lot and asked the developers to ensure that the parking lot could handle the added trips. Williams also said that there would need to be a waiver for number of parking spaces, since the requirement would be 51 spaces and the plan only has 50 spaces. Williams also asked that the outdoor seating be shown on the plan. Williams then asked Mr. Bombaci to confirm that the retention pond would drain in between storms. Mr. Bombaci said that it would and the maximum amount of time that the water would remain in the pond was one day. Vice-Chair Lyles recommended that the developers also provide a summary sheet with the traffic study since all members of the Board will not understand the details of the study. Chair DeLeo restated that if there were any improvements to traffic signals would be at the cost of the developer. Mr. Bombaci said that he understood that. City Planner Williams said that the Traffic Movement Permit process may change some of the plans, so they should wait until that process is completed before making final determinations as to what work needs to be done on the traffic signals.

Secretary Geel moved to find the preliminary plan complete. Vice-Chair Lyles seconded the motion. The vote to find complete the Preliminary Plan of a Major Use Site Development entitled <u>Proposed Commercial Development</u> for Applicant Alrig USA Acquisitions LLC and Owner Ellsworth No. 1 LLC was UNANIMOUS (5-0).

7.) Final Plan Review of a Minor Subdivision entitled <u>Langley/Rayeless LLC</u> for Owner/Applicant Brian Langley. The proposal is to create a tri-plex structure creating a three dwelling unit structure subdivision. The subject property is an approximately 1.2-acre lot located at 19 South Street (Map 134, Lot 214-1) in the Neighborhood (N) Zoning District.

Nicholas Wood was present representing the Applicant. Mr. Wood stated that they have added the stormwater calculations into the narrative. He also said that based on the calculations, they decided to put in two 30-inch culverts to give more space than is needed to move the stormwater runoff. City Planner Williams said that they have also added a widened space of about 20 feet to the parking lot to allow for oil trucks and dump trucks to be able to access the portion of the lot that houses the propane tank and the dumpster. Williams also said that they have added vegetation onto the plan like the Board requested

Public Hearing Opened and Closed

COMPLETE

Langley/Rayeless

Introduction

as well as adding the width of the driveway onto the plan. Williams said that the width was sufficient for fire trucks to be able to access the development.

Chair DeLeo asked about Fire and Life Safety Inspector Canavan's note saying that the parking area would need to be paved. Canavan said that this was per his ordinance. Mr. Wood said that the owner had concerns regarding cost and the addition of impervious surface into the area. DeLeo asked City Planner Williams if this was something that the Planning Board could waive. Williams said that this is different than a waiver for a private street since they are talking about a parking area. DeLeo pointed out that they will also need to create a private street and asked why there would need to be a private street for this development. Williams said that was because the ordinance says that it must be a street given the amount of dwellings it services. There was some discussion as to who could grant a waiver for the pavement of a parking area, or if that requirement could be waived at all. Williams said that he would need to discuss those issues with legal counsel. The Board noted that there are some inconsistencies between the development code and the fire code. Vice-Chair Lyles asked if there was a way that the developer could ask for a waiver at this meeting and it be made a condition of approval. Canavan said that they could not ask for the waiver at this time and they would need to submit a written request. Alternate Member Hangge pointed out that both gravel and pavement are impervious surfaces, so it would add impervious surfaces no matter what. Mr. Wood said that he would need to discuss with the Applicant before he could commit to paving.

Alternate Member Hangge told the Board that they should ask for the letter from the Attorney General regarding the firewall to have as part of the public record. He said they should do this as evidence that the Attorney General said that the City does not have the ability to require the developer to put in a 2-hour firewall. City Planner Williams asked the Board if they would be willing to hold a special meeting to resolve these discussions after he has had an opportunity to discuss the issue with the City's legal counsel. The Board agreed to hold a special meeting. Chair DeLeo urged Williams to get it scheduled as soon as possible. Williams said he will look into the earliest possibility for a meeting and he will reach out to everyone on the following day.

Vice-Chair Lyles moved to table the item until the special meeting. Secretary Geel seconded the motion. The vote to table the Final Plan Review of a Minor Subdivision entitled <u>Langley/Rayless LLC</u> for Owner/Applicant Brian Langley was UNANIMOUS (5-0).

8.) Staff Comments

City Planner Williams gave an update of where the Comprehensive Plan process was at. He said that the public engagement portion will be beginning in a few weeks and they will be holding many public events throughout the summer in order to collect the most information possible. Williams said that the consultant will be launching a website soon that the public can access for information and to give comments on different aspects of the plan. Secretary Geel asked if that website would be moderated. Williams said that the consultant will be monitoring the website and it has programming which will automatically

Discussion

TABELED

Staff Comments

screen certain things out like foul language. The consultants are also working on the inventory and analysis portion of the plan. They will be reaching out to Staff in the coming days for help with obtaining the information.

9.) Adjournment Vote to adjourn at 7:17 PM Vice-Chair Lyles moved to adjourn, Secretary Geel seconded the motion. The vote to adjourn was unanimous (5-0). Minutes prepared by: Elizabeth Littlefield, Assistant City Planner. Agendas and minutes posted on the City of Ellsworth's website: ellsworthmaine.gov Date Nelson Geel, Secretary A video transcript of Ellsworth Planning Board this meeting is also available on YouTube.